UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/505,390 | 08/20/2004 | Alain Durand | PF020015 | 7244 | |
| | 7590 10/17/2007 | | EXAM | INER | |
| Joseph S Tripoli Patent Department | | | ALMEIDA, DEVIN E | | |
| Thomson Licensing Inc PO Box 5312 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Princeton, NJ 08543-5312 | | | 2132 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 10/17/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | _ |
|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 10/505,390 | DURAND, ALAIN | j |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Devin Almeida | 2132 | |

| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Devin Almeida | 2132 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>03 October 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance, (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complifollowing time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | ice, which CFR 41.31; or |
| a) The period for reply expire 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing da (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (f). | ate of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS F | ILED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the ped of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | and the corresponding amount of the fe statutory period for reply originally set i | e. The appropriate exterior in the final Office action; | nsion fee under 37 or (2) as rise of (b) |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any expine a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENIATED. | tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), | to avoid dismissal of | the appeal. |
| AMENDMENTS | but prior to the data of filing a brief | will not be entered | haaayaa |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | pecause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | • | ducing or simplifying | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | ected claims. | |
| 4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | · · | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL -324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | , | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | illowable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendme | ent canceling |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a). how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ill be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4 and 5</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a fina l action, be | ut hoforo or on the date of filing a N | lotice of Anneal will r | est he entered |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | - | , ,, | • |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | ut does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | ^ | , |
| 13. Other: See Continuation Sheet. | 130 | ラカー | |
| | GILBERTO BA | ARRON TO | |
| | SUPERVISORY PATE | — | |

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's arguments filed 10/03/2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive Ques et al teaches a secret specific to a second domain (i.e. the local private key Kpri.loc page 9 lines 28 -34). The cable network sends data scrambled with cw these cw are transmitted in the data stream encrypted using key k (the key of the first network i.e. cable network). The access device 1 decrypts the encrypted cw using key k and re-encrypts the cw with the key is the second network the Kpub.loc of the Kpub.loc/Kpri.loc pair so only devices on the second network with the Kpri.loc can decrypt the data (page 8 lines 7 -34).

Both Ques and Ford have to do with transmitting data from one device to another device in encrypted form. Ques teach hes encrypting with an asymmetric key with Ford teach that a symmetric key would be better for bulk encrypting and decryption of data because of the lower computing overhead needed.